

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

February 22, 2005 LB 570

why is it necessary to point out in this provision that the treaty trumps?

SENATOR LANDIS: My guess is that you probably don't have to be a constitutional scholar to understand that it's probably superfluous. However, notice it does say what does trump this. It says, a treaty; I think, what, a federal law; and then a state regulatory law. Oftentimes, because these are...this is the regulation of private transaction between some merchants and nonmerchants. But if a state wants to step in and regulate, that takes precedence over this general business code, if you will, in the Uniform Commercial Code. It would be superfluous, I suppose, because in any challenge, a court would rule consistent with this. If there's a place where there's anyplace where it particularly might be of value, it's in saying that the state regulatory law supersedes this law. But there can be no doubt.

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: We don't have to say it in this bill to make a treaty trump this code.

SENATOR BEUTLER: So what this illustrates, would it be fair to say, is that a treaty entered into by our federal representatives, the President of the United States, and affirmed by our federal representatives, could essentially wipe out, for purposes of any applicability outside the state, any of our commercial rules?

SENATOR LANDIS: Any of our commercial rules, any federal law. Understand, the only thing that trumps a treaty is the constitution, and that's it.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay.

SENATOR LANDIS: And every other form of law is secondary.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Thank you, Senator Landis.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator